

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/888,668	Applicant(s) YAO, MENG	
	Examiner Peter K. Huntsinger	Art Unit 2625	

All Participants:

 (1) Peter K. Huntsinger.

 (2) Michael J. Nickerson
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 June 2007
Time: 4 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

USC 102 rejection of claim 6

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

Stanich '813
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 AUNG S. MOE
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the attorney that the arguments in relation to the rejections of claims 1-5 and 7-15 were persuasive and the rejections would be dropped. The examiner explained that the arguments in relation to claim 6 were not persuasive and that if the limitation of claims 1 and 9 was added to claim 6, the claim would be allowable. The attorney agreed to the amendment on 6/18/07.